



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

08/947,254 10/08/97 VORBACH

M 2885/10

EXAMINER

LM21/0720

EDWARD J HANDLER III
KENYON AND KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK NY 10004

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED:

07/20/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/947,254

Applicant
Vorbach et al.

Examiner
Gopal C. Ray

Group Art Unit
2781



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 2, 1999

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), ~~or thirty days, whichever is longer~~, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 19-38 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☒ Claim(s) 28, 29, and 31 - 33 is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 19, 20, 35, and 36 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 21-27, 30, 34, 37, and 38 is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2781

1. The examiner acknowledges the addition of claims 35-38 by the amendment filed on 7/2/99. Claims 19-38 are presented for examination.
2. The amendment to the drawings filed on 7/2/99 are approved by the examiner.
3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 19, 20, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 4,852,048 issued to Morton in view of US Patent 5,659,767 issued to Zandveld et al.

As per claim 19, the reference of Morton teaches "a processing unit, the processing unit having a multi-dimensional programmable cell architecture; and a plurality of individual lines positioned within the processing unit; wherein the plurality of individual lines provide communication between the processing unit and at least one of : i) an additional processing unit, ii) a memory device, and iii) a peripheral device" in Fig. 1 and col. 9, line 5 - col. 10, line 34.

Art Unit: 2781

The reference of Morton does not explicitly show "the plurality of individual lines being bundled". However, the above feature was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention as evidenced by Zandveld et al. The reference of Zandveld et al. teaches the feature in abstract, line 8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morton to include the above feature of Zandveld et al. because that would allow the system of Morton to efficiently interface external devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Morton using the above feature of Zandveld et al. to obtain the claimed invention.

As per claim 35, the reference of Morton teaches "wherein the memory device is external to the processing unit" in col. 5, line 40.

As per claim 20, the claim is rejected for similar reasons as discussed in the rejection of claim 19 with the exception of "interface unit combining the plurality of individual lines to form the bus system". However, the reference of Morton teaches the feature in Fig. 2.

As per claim 36, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in the rejection of claim 35.

Art Unit: 2781

5. Claims 28, 29 and 31³³ are allowable. Claims 21-27, 30, ~~32~~ 34, 37 and 38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/2/99 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gopal C. Ray whose telephone number is (703) 305-9647. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh, can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9051/9052.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [Ayaz.sheikh@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality

Serial Number: 08/947,254

Page 5

Art Unit: 2781

requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Gopal C. Ray

**GOPAL C. RAY
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2100**